



Texas Department of Insurance

Division of Workers' Compensation

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645

512-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • www.tdi.texas.gov

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address

VISTA MEDICAL CENTER HOSPITAL
4301 VISTA ROAD
PASADENA, TEXAS 77504

Carrier's Austin Representative Box

29

Respondent Name

CITY OF HOUSTON

MFDR Date Received

May 11, 2005

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-05-8151-02

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary Dated June 9, 2005: "if the total audited charges for *the entire admission* are below \$40,000, the Carrier may reimburse at a 'per diem' rate for the hospital services. However, if the total audited charges for the entire admission are at or above \$40,000, the Carrier shall reimburse using the 'Stop Loss Reimbursement Factor' (SLRF). The SLRF of 75% is applied to the '*entire admission*'. In this instance, the audited charges that remained in dispute after the last bill review by the insurance carrier were \$40,509.70...the Carrier is required to reimburse the remainder of...\$28,145.27..."

Amount in Dispute: \$28,145.27

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary as stated on the Table of Disputed Services Received May 31, 2005:

"Carrier abides by determination made by Concentra bill review."

Response Submitted by: Sandra Wilson, Cambridge Integrated

Respondent's Supplemental Position Summary Dated September 8, 2011: "With consideration of the final judgment in *Texas Mutual Insurance Co. v. Vista Community Medical Center*...City of Houston supplements their originally filed response to the MFD with the enclosed information. Healthcare provider Vista Medical Center has failed to demonstrate that the dates of service meet the minimum requirements set out under TDI-DWC Rule 134.401(c)(6)...and that the admission involved unusually costly and unusually extensive services..."

Response Submitted by: Pappas & Suchma PC

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Disputed Dates	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
May 29 through 30, 2004	Inpatient Hospital Services	\$28,145.27	\$0.00

FINDINGS AND DECISION

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

Background

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.305 and §133.307, 27 *Texas Register* 12282, applicable to requests filed on or after January 1, 2003, sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, 22 *Texas Register* 6264, effective August 1, 1997, sets out the fee guidelines for inpatient services rendered in an acute care hospital.

The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:

Explanation of Benefits

- F – Fee guideline MAR reduction
- 855-002 – recommended allowance is in accordance with workers compensation medical fee schedule
- 080 – review of this bill has resulted in an adjusted reimbursement

Dispute M4-05-8151 was originally decided on September 19, 2008 and subsequently appealed to a contested case hearing at the State Office of Administrative Hearings (SOAH) under case number 454-09-0788.M4. This dispute was then remanded to the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation (TDI-DWC) pursuant to a February 16, 2009 SOAH order of remand. As a result of the remand order, the dispute was re-docketed at medical fee dispute resolution and is hereby reviewed.

Issues

1. Did the audited charges exceed \$40,000.00?
2. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually extensive services?
3. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually costly services?
4. Is the requestor entitled to additional reimbursement?

Findings

This dispute relates to inpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, titled *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, effective August 1, 1997, 22 *Texas Register* 6264. The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion in *Texas Mutual Insurance Company v. Vista Community Medical Center, LLP*, 275 *South Western Reporter Third* 538, 550 (Texas Appeals – Austin 2008, petition denied) addressed a challenge to the interpretation of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401. The Court concluded that "to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved unusually costly and unusually extensive services." Both the requestor and respondent in this case were notified via form letter that the mandate for the decision cited above was issued on January 19, 2011. Each party was given the opportunity to supplement their original MDR submission, position or response as applicable. The division received supplemental information as noted in the position summaries above. The documentation filed to the division by the requestor and respondent to date is considered. Consistent with the Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion, and 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6), the division will address whether the requestor demonstrated that: audited charges ***in this case*** exceed \$40,000; the admission and disputed services ***in this case*** are unusually extensive; and that the admission and disputed services ***in this case*** are unusually costly.

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6)(A)(i) states "...to be eligible for stop-loss payment the total audited charges for a hospital admission must exceed \$40,000, the minimum stop-loss threshold." Furthermore, (A) (v) of that same section states "...Audited charges are those charges which remain after a bill review by the insurance carrier has been performed..." Review of the explanation of benefits issued by the carrier finds that the carrier did not deduct any charges in accordance with §134.401(c)(6)(A)(v); therefore the audited charges equal \$40,509.70. The division concludes that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000.
2. The requestor in its original position statement asserts that "...if the total audited charges for the entire admission are below \$40,000, the Carrier may reimburse at a 'per diem' rate for the hospital services. However, if the total audited charges for the entire admission are at or above \$40,000, the Carrier shall reimburse using the 'Stop Loss Reimbursement Factor' (SLRF). The SLRF of 75% is applied to the 'entire

admission'. In its position statement, the requestor presumes that it is entitled to the stop loss method of payment because the audited charges exceed \$40,000. As noted above, the Third Court of Appeals in its November 13, 2008 opinion rendered judgment to the contrary. The Court concluded that "to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved...unusually extensive services." The requestor failed to discuss the particulars of the admission in dispute that constitute unusually extensive services, therefore, the division finds that the requestor did not meet 28 TAC §134.401(c) (6).

3. In regards to whether the services were unusually costly, the Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion concluded that in order to be eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss exception, a hospital must demonstrate that an admission involved unusually costly services thereby affirming 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) which states that "Stop-loss is an independent reimbursement methodology established to ensure fair and reasonable compensation to the hospital for unusually costly services rendered during treatment to an injured worker." The requestor failed to discuss the particulars of the admission in dispute that constitute unusually costly services, therefore, the division finds that the requestor failed to meet 28 TAC §134.401(c)(6).
4. For the reasons stated above the services in dispute are not eligible for the stop-loss method of reimbursement. Consequently, reimbursement shall be calculated pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount* and §134.401(c)(4) titled *Additional Reimbursements*. The division notes that additional reimbursements under §134.401(c)(4) apply only to bills that do not reach the stop-loss threshold described in subsection (c)(6) of this section.
 - Review of the submitted documentation finds that the services provided were surgical; therefore the standard per diem amount of \$1,118.00 per day applies. Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(3)(ii) states, in pertinent part, that "The applicable Workers' Compensation Standard Per Diem Amount (SPDA) is multiplied by the length of stay (LOS) for admission..." The length of stay was one day. The surgical per diem rate of \$1,118.00 multiplied by the length of stay of one day results in an allowable amount of \$1,118.00.
 - 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(4)(C) states "Pharmaceuticals administered during the admission and greater than \$250 charged per dose shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%. Dose is the amount of a drug or other substance to be administered at one time." A review of the submitted itemized statement finds that the requestor billed \$425.00/unit for Morphine PCA. The requestor did not submit documentation to support what the cost to the hospital was for this item billed under revenue code 250. For that reason, reimbursement for this item cannot be recommended.

The division concludes that the total allowable for this admission is \$1118.00. The respondent issued payment in the amount of \$1118.00. Based upon the documentation submitted, no additional reimbursement can be recommended.

Conclusion

The submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The requestor in this case demonstrated that the audited charges exceed \$40,000, but failed to discuss and demonstrate that the disputed inpatient hospital admission involved unusually extensive, and unusually costly services. Consequently, 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount*, and §134.401(c)(4) titled *Additional Reimbursements* are applied and result in no additional reimbursement.

ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the division has determined that the requestor is entitled to \$0.00 reimbursement for the disputed services.

Authorized Signature

Signature

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution

December , 2012
Date

YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute may appeal this decision by requesting a contested case hearing. A completed **Request for a Medical Contested Case Hearing** (form **DWC045A**) must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision*** together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party.**

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.